

(MR. SPEAKER.)

The purpose underlying the prohibition of such questions is clearly to prevent any questions being asked in relation to a matter which is before a Court and is therefore likely either directly or indirectly to prejudice a case under trial.

It therefore follows that unless a court has taken cognisance of a matter, it would not become '*sub-judice*' and the prohibition in Rule 26 (2) (p) would not apply. The filing of a First Information Report or of other steps taken prior to the filing of a charge-sheet or prior to a court taking cognisance of a matter would not make a matter *sub-judice*. Of course, each such point of order has to be decided on its merits and a ruling can be given only on the facts and circumstances of each case.

There are a number of rulings and the point is not therefore lacking in authority. But on this occasion and in view of the clear wording of our Rules of Procedure, it is unnecessary to refer to any of them.

#### Statement of objects and reasons with reference to an amended Bill.

MR. SPEAKER.—During the October Session of last year, when the Cattle Trespass Bill as passed by the Legislative Council was proposed to be discussed on the motion for consideration, some members objected on the ground that the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bill bore no relation to the Bill. I gave a ruling on that occasion to the effect that the Bill was not being introduced in the Assembly for the first time and that therefore, strictly it was not necessary for a Statement of Objects and Reasons to accompany the Bill. I stated that our practice was however to permit the Bill together with the Statement of Objects and Reasons as originally appended to the Bill in order to give the Members of the House an idea of the purposes underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House. I also stated that I would get this question examined again.

I find that the practice in different legislatures differs. But in view of the

objection taken, I have made arrangements, from this Session onwards, to see that where a Bill which is passed by the Legislative Council is thereafter taken up in this House, the copies of the Bill to be distributed among the Members will not carry any Statement of Objects and Reasons. Only the Bill as finally passed by the Legislative Council will be printed and supplied to the Members. However, in order that the Members may have some idea of the objects underlying the Bill when it was first introduced in the other House, I have, with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Legislative Council, arranged that copies of Bills introduced in one House will be made available to the Members of the other House also.

#### STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE.

##### Re : Central assistance to Shimsha Extension Scheme.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Minister for Agriculture wants to make a statement, He may do so now.

DR. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—(Minister for Agriculture).—With permission of the Hon'ble Speaker, I rise to make the following statement :—

It may be recalled that on the concluding day of the previous session of the House, I replied in the affirmative to a supplementary question under Question No. 322 put by Hon'ble member Sri M. V. Rama Rao as to whether Central assistance of Rs. 150 lakhs had been given to the State for executing the Shimsha Extension Scheme. I regret that a mistake occurred in furnishing this answer. As the question came up at a very late stage of the session there was no time for me to place the correct position before the House. I am therefore taking the earliest opportunity of doing so.

2. The Shimsha Extension Project is one of the schemes included in the Five-Year Plan and is estimated to cost about Rs. 345 lakhs. The question of executing the Project has been under correspondence with the Planning